

### **REMARKS**

The Office Action mailed April 5, 2005 has been carefully reviewed along with the references cited therein. In the subject Office Action the Examiner objected to the replaced paragraph provided in a previous response. The Examiner also rejected claims 1, 3, 8, 10-12 and 25. Claims 10, 26, 28 and 29 were objected to because of minor informalities. Claims 1, 3, 10 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Murata et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,929,866). Claim 25 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Mohacsi et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0223235). Claims 1, 8, 10 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ueda et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,601,970). Claims 2, 5, 13, 26, 28 and 29 were indicated as containing allowable subject matter. Claims 15-24 and 27 were allowed. Applicants appreciate the indication of allowable subject matter.

#### **Specification**

The specification has been amended in accordance with the Examiner's suggestions.

#### **Claim Objections**

Claims 10, 26 and 28 have been amended to overcome the Examiner's objections.

#### **Claim Rejections**

The claims have been amended to recite that the envelope includes a light-transmissive portion, which at least includes a transparent portion and a translucent portion. Support for these claim amendments is found throughout the specification and in the figures.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite "said reflector comprises a material having greater light diffusing properties along a first axis than along a second axis." This limitation was previously presented in claim 5, which the Examiner indicated as allowable.

Accordingly, claim 1 and those claims that depend from claim 1 are in condition for allowance.

Claim 25 has been amended to recite "an opaque portion adjacent the light-transmissive portion and formed integrally with the light-transmissive portion." Support for this limitation is found in FIGURE 2 and page 3 of the application. Claim 25 was rejected as being anticipated by Mohacsi et al. The opaque portion 14, as referred to by the Examiner, in Mohacsi et al. is not formed integrally with the light-transmissive portion. Therefore, claim 25 is no longer anticipated by Mohacsi et al. Furthermore, Mohacsi et al. fails to provide any motivation to modify such that the opaque portion is formed integrally with the light-transmissive portion. Accordingly, claim 25, and those claims that depend from claim 25, are in condition for allowance.

Claim 30 has been added to the application and recites, among other things, "a flexible power cord" and "an LED attached to said flexible power cord." Claim 12 recited a similar limitation and was rejected in view of Ueda et al. The lighting system in Ueda et al. fails to disclose an LED attached to a flexible power cord. To the contrary, the LEDs 17 in Ueda et al. attach to a holding board 15, i.e. a printed circuit board, that is fixed to the reflector 16. The LEDs are not attached to the flexible power cord in Ueda et al. The lead wires of the LED 17 are inserted into holes and soldered to printed wiring on the holding board 15. (Col. 9, lines 27-28). That which the Examiner argues is a flexible power cord in FIG. 11 electrically connects a power supply board 20 to the holding board 15; the power cord does not attach to the LEDs. Accordingly, claim 30 is not anticipated by Ueda et al. Furthermore, Ueda et al. provides no motivation to modify such that the LEDs would attach to the flexible power cord. Accordingly, claim 30, and those claims that depend from claim 30, are in condition for allowance.

### **CONCLUSION**

For the reasons detailed above, it is submitted that all claims remaining in the application are now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, an early indication of the same is earnestly solicited. In any event, should the Examiner consider personal contact


advantageous to the disposition of this case, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

FAY, SHARPE, FAGAN,  
MINNICH & MCKEE, LLP

June 30, 2005

Date



Scott A. McCollister, Reg. No. 33,961  
Jonathan A. Withrow, Reg. No. 54,548  
1100 Superior Avenue  
7<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-2579  
(216) 861-5582

Certificate of Mailing

Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.8, I certify that this Amendment is being

- ☒ deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class mail, addressed to: MAIL STOP AMENDMENT, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date indicated below.
- ☐ transmitted via facsimile in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.8 on the date indicated below.
- ☐ deposited with the United States Postal Service "Express Mail Post Office to Addressee" service under 37 C.F.R. 1.10 on the date indicated below and is addressed to: MAIL STOP AMENDMENT, Commissioner For Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

<b>Express Mail Label No.:</b>
<b>Date</b> <b>June 30, 2005</b>

<b>Signature</b>
<b>Printed Name</b> <b>Audrey M. Dragony</b>